| ·—· | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 08/962,094 | BILLING-MEDEL ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Jehanne S. Sitton | 1634 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Non final rejection</u> | | |
| (1) <u>Jehanne S. Sitton</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Lisa Mueller</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 6 May 2005 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: | | |
| Ciairis discussed. | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Applicant's representative indicated that only an extension of time was filed in response to the Non final rejection mailed 10/29/2004. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. | examiner will provide a writte | en summary of the substance |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | | |
| | | · |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Ochowal Sitto. | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | |